

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 14-20 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 14, 18 and 19 have been rejected.

Claims 2-5, 8, 10, 11, 15-17, and 20 are objected to.

Claims 21 and 22 have been added. Support for these claims can be found, at least, in claims 4 and 20.

Claims 1-3, 5, 8-11, and 14-17 have been amended. No new matter has been added by these amendments. The amendments to claims 2, 3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, and 16 do not narrow the scope of the claims. Support for the amendment to claim 17 can be found in FIG. 2 and on page 7, lines 1-8 of the specification.

Phone Interview Conducted on January 12, 2005

Appreciation is expressed for the telephone interview conducted on January 12, 2005 between Examiner Duong and Brenna Brock, applicants' attorney. During the interview, the 112 rejection of claim 2 as well as possible amendments to claims 1 and 14 were discussed. The undersigned believes this paper is in harmony with the positions expressed during the interview.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. During the telephone interview, the Examiner acknowledged that this rejection erroneously referred to claim 2, which does not contain the language referred to in the rejection. Accordingly, Applicants believe this rejection to be moot.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 14, 18, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ishikawa (U.S. Pat. No. 5,748,018). While Applicants continue to maintain that these claims, as presented prior to the present amendment, are patentable over the cited art, Applicants have amended the independent claims in order to expedite issuance of the application.

With respect to amended claim 1, the cited art clearly fails to teach or suggest a “source synchronous clocking system, comprising: a source clock domain in a first network protocol layer ...wherein said first network protocol layer comprises one of: a link layer and a PHY layer,” as recited in amended claim 1. As noted in previous responses, the cited art fails to teach or suggest network protocol layers such as a link layer and a PHY layer. Particularly, the cited art fails to teach or suggest that the source clock domain comprises one of a link layer and a PHY layer, as recited in claim 1. The Examiner cites the data output circuit 100 of FIG. 3A of Ishikawa as being “a first layer” and the data input circuit 200 in the same figure as being “a second layer.” Office Action, pp. 2-3. However, neither of these circuits are implementing a network protocol layer that comprises one of a link layer and a PHY layer (in fact, none of the terms “network”, “layer”, or “protocol” are used in Ishikawa). Since the cited art clearly neither teaches nor suggests a source clock domain that comprises one of a link layer and a PHY layer, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 2-9 are patentable over the cited art for at least the foregoing reasons. Claims 9-11 and 14-17 are patentable over the cited art for similar reasons.

Added Claims

Claims 21 and 22 have been added. Claims 21 and 22 correspond to claims 4 and 20 respectively, as rewritten in independent form. Claims 4 and 20 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Office Action, p. 4. Accordingly, Applicant believes these claims to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5087.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on January 19, 2005.

Brenna A. Brock

Attorney for Applicant(s)

1-19-2005

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

Brenna A. Brock

Brenna A. Brock

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 48,509

(512) 439-5087 [Phone]

(512) 439-5099 [Fax]